TETRA TECH NUS, INC.
55 Jonspin Road ▪ Wilmington, MA 01887-1020
(978) 658-7899 ▪ FAX (978) 658-7870 ▪ www.tetratech.com

C-NAVY-8-98-1216W

August 4, 1998

Project Number 5278

Mr. James X. Shafer
Remedial Project Manager
Northern Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command
10 Industrial Highway, Mail Stop 82
Lester, Pennsylvania 19113

Reference: CLEAN Contract No. N62472-90-D-1298
Contract Task Order 218

Subject: RAB Meeting Minutes

Dear Mr. Shafer:

Enclosed is a copy of the minutes from the July 15, 1998 RAB meeting. If you have any questions about this matter, please contact me at 978-658-7899.

Very truly yours,

Betsy Horne
Community Relations Specialist

BH:b

Enclosures

c:

Dr. D. K. Abbass (w/enc.)
Ms. Barbara Barrow (w/enc.)
Ms. Anne Berman (w/enc.)
Ms. Mary A. Blake (w/enc.)
Dr. David W. Brown (w/enc.)
Mr. Richard D. Coogan (w/enc.)
Mr. Paul M. Cormier (w/enc.)
Mr. Anthony D'Agnenica (w/enc.)
Ms. Beth Everett (w/enc.)
Mr. Mike Foley (w/enc.)

c: Mr. Byron J. Hall (w/enc.)
Ms. Elizabeth Mathinos (w/enc.)
Mr. Joseph Mello (w/enc.)
Mr. Thomas McGrath (w/enc.)
Mr. John Palmieri (w/enc.)
Mr. Howard L. Porter (w/enc.)
Mr. Paul D. Russell (w/enc.)
Mr. Charles Salmond (w/enc.)
Mr. John Torgan (w/enc.)
Ms. Claudette Weissinger (w/enc.)
Ms. Mary Philcox (w/enc.)
Mr. David Egan (w/enc.)
Mr. Tom Nicholson (w/enc.)
Mr. Paul Kulpa, DEM (w/enc.)
Ms. Kymberlee Keckler, EPA (w/enc.)
Capt. Jon Wyman, NETC (w/enc.)
Capt. Bogle, NETC (w/enc.)
Mr. James Barden (w/enc.)
Hon. Paul W. Crowley (w/enc.)
Hon. June Gibbs (w/enc.)
Mr. Joseph F. McEnness (w/enc.)
Councilman Dennis McCoy (w/enc.)
Mr. Vincent Arnold (w/enc.)
Dr. David Kim (w/enc.)
Mr. Brian Bishop (w/enc.)
Sister Annie Marie Walsh (w/enc.)
Brother Joseph (w/enc.)
Newport Public Library (w/enc.)
Ms. Joanne Gorman, Middletown Free Library (w/enc.)
Portsmouth Free Public Library (w/enc.)
Mr. Bob Jones, Groton (w/enc.)
Mr. David Sanders, NETC (w/enc.)
Mr. David Dorocz, NETC (w/enc.)
Ms. Melissa Griffin, NETC (w/enc.)
Mr. Woody Monaco, NETC (w/enc.)
Ms. Sarah White, EPA (w/enc.)
Ms. Jennifer Hayes, Gannett Fleming (w/enc.)
Mr. Tim Prior, USF&WS (w/enc.)
Mr. Ken Finkelstein, NOAA (w/enc.)
Mr. R. Boucher, NORTHDIV (w/o enc.)
Ms. Diane McKenna, B&RE, Wilmington (w/enc.)
Mr. Garth Glenn, B&RE, Philadelphia (w/enc.)
Ms. Meg Price, B&RE, Philadelphia (w/o enc.)
File 5278-3.2 w/o enc./9.4 w/enc.

**NAVAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING CENTER**
**RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING**
**JULY 15, 1998**

MINUTES

On Wednesday, July 15, 1998, the NETC Newport Installation Restoration Program Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) gathered at NETC's Building 1 for a tour of the IR sites. The tour began at 5:15 pm and ended at 8 pm. The RAB was invited back to the Officers' Club for pastry.

Eleven of the 20 RAB community members attended: Kathy Abbass, Mary Blake, David Brown, Dick Coogan, Paul Cormier, Beth Everett, Joseph Mello (who is replacing Al Arruda), Tom McGrath, John Palmieri, Howard Porter, and Claudette Weissinger. Other RAB members attending were: Paul Kulpa, the RIDEM Remedial Project Manager; Kymberlee Keckler, EPA Remedial Project Manager; Jim Shafer, NORTHDIV's Remedial Project Manager; and Captain Jon Wyman, Navy Co-chair. Melissa Griffin was present from the NETC Environmental Division; Pete DuBois represented the Public Affairs Office. Brian Helland, the Underground Storage Tank project manager was present. Sarah White, EPA's Community Involvement Coordinator, also attended, as did several other EPA employees: Sarah McGuiness, Dave Peterson, Bart Hoskins, Mike Galana, and Dan Huber. Dave Egan, the TAG recipient's technical advisor was present. Barbara Barrow, Anne Berman, Tony D'Agnenica, Mike Foley, Byron Hall, Liz Mathinos, Paul Russell, Chuck Salmond, and John Torgan were not present.

As the group boarded a bus for the tour, they were greeted by Jim Shafer. As the bus drove to the first site, Jim explained that because NETC's sites are on the coast, the studies are longer (and the resulting costs are greater) because environmental studies need to be conducted on the offshore areas as well as the onshore areas.

Before each stop, NETC passed out one-page summaries of site information. Dave Brown also distributed a list of questions and concerns the Planning Committee compiled that they hoped the Navy would address at each site. At each stop, Paul Kulpa passed out photographs of the site and gave a brief presentation.

MELVILLE NORTH LANDFILL - SITE 2

Jim explained that the site was not included on the National Priorities List (NPL) because the property was not owned by the Navy when NETC was placed on the NPL in 1989. However, the Navy is cleaning it up, under Rhode Island regulatory requirements, for the current owner, Melville Marine Industries.

The 10-acre site was used from 1945 to 1955 to dispose of domestic refuse, spent acids, waste paints, solvents, waste oil, and PCBs. As a Formerly Used Defense Site, it was transferred to the state, and then sold to Melville Marine Industries. Two removal actions

have occurred. Paul discussed the removal action at the northern end of the landfill. In 1993, the Navy removed approximately 800 cubic yards of PCB- and petroleum-contaminated soil. However, the problem was greater than originally anticipated and contaminated soil was left behind when funds ran out. The State's photographs depicted soil saturated with petroleum immediately below surface soil that did not appear to be contaminated.

Site investigations were completed in 1997 and a remedial action work plan will be submitted in the fall of 1998. The Navy anticipates beginning the final cleanup in 1999.

The Navy originally thought they would only have to clean the site to commercial standards. However, after discussions with the owner and RIDEM, it was determined that the site requires cleanup to residential standards. (The owner has a permit to dredge and place the materials on the site.) The Navy has estimated that cleaning up the site to residential standards would require approximately $6 million, resulting in no need for imposing land use restrictions. Because of its limited budget, the cleanup may have to be phased over 2 or more years. The contaminants of concern are arsenic, lead, and total petroleum hydrocarbons.

Paul added that the PVC pipes sticking up from the site were installed during the 1995 removal action. He stated that RIDEM's estimate of disposing of the lead, PCB, petroleum, and asbestos contaminated soil at a RCRA subtitle C landfill would cost between $200 and $300 per cubic yard. To reduce costs, the state recommended that the soil be stabilized with concrete, allowing the material to be disposed of as a non-RCRA waste. RIDEM also recommended that the soil be shipped to McAllister Point Landfill

As a worst case, approximately 37,000 cubic yards need to be excavated, of which about 7,000 are in the water table. The Navy and RIDEM have an agreement that if they excavat everything, there will be no need to conduct an ecological risk assessment.

Comment: Have you considered other alternatives?
Response: Yes. Excavation appears to be the least expensive option. McAllister Point's cap cost $13 million so $6 million, the estimated cost for total removal, with no long-term monitoring or and ecological risk assessment, looks relatively attractive.

Comment: What about the site wetlands?
Response: The landfill was created by filling the wetlands. Some still exist to the north and northeast of the site. The owner has agreed to open up the wetlands to allow salt water back into them.

Comment: Are you getting pressure from the site owner?
Response: Melville North Landfill is one of our worst sites. Understandably, the owner is concerned that his marina permit will expire and is anxious to get the cleanup underway. We have tried to be good neighbors.

Comment: How much will the cleanup cost per year?

Response: We will ask for all of the funds required to clean up the site to residential standards. It may be possible to obtain all the funding next year or we may have to phase the cleanup over several years.

TANK FARM FIVE - SITE 13

Jim stated that Tank Farm Five is one of five tank farms at NETC; they are all being cleaned up under the NORTHDIV underground storage tank (UST) program; the project manager is Brian Helland. Because CERCLA contains a petroleum exclusion, UST cleanups at NETC are regulated by RIDEM. The bulk of the work at Tank Farm Five has been conducted under the UST program. The CERCLA (and therefore IR Program) component at Tank Farm Five involves Tanks 53 and 56 and the site groundwater associated with those tanks.

Tank Farm Five is an 85-acre site, active until the mid 1970s. It contained 11 2.5 million gallon concrete USTs, with a total capacity of 27 million gallons. After the tank farm was closed, Tanks 53 and 56 were used to store waste oil (from 1975 to 1980). In 1990, it was discovered that at some point Tank 53 had released waste oil to groundwater. To address the contaminated groundwater, the Navy signed an interim record of decision (ROD) in 1992 that required construction and operation of a 1.7 million gallon groundwater pump and treat facility, which came on line in 1994. (At the same time, the UST program began cleaning and ballasting the tanks, and excavated the ring drain around Tank 53).

The pump and treat system was shut down in 1996 because the groundwater it was drawing did not contain any detectable contaminants. As a result, the Navy thinks the site groundwater is clean and has requested a permanent shut down; three seasons of monitoring confirm the water is clean. Its position is that a "No Further Action" ROD is warranted. EPA concurs with the action. RIDEM, however, has requested more monitoring data, and has asked the Navy to install two more bedrock monitoring wells between the tank, and the pump and treat system bedrock extraction wells.

A soil gas survey that RIDEM requested will be conducted to appropriately site the new wells. A work plan to implement the survey was submitted to RIDEM on June 22, 1998. Paul indicated that state's comments will follow. The Navy is hoping that the soil gas survey will also respond to RIDEM's concerns about whether Tank Farm Five also used trenches (in addition to its incinerator) to dispose of sludge from tank cleaning. Once agreement is reached on the survey, the Navy expects to install the wells before the end of this calendar year. The Navy has funded a no further action decision document, which would be preceded by a proposed plan for public comment. The Navy hopes to proceed with the proposed plan in 1999.

Paul passed out photographs depicting the cleanup of the site oil/water separator. He noted that investigations conducted under the RIDEM program revealed that contaminated surface soil and groundwater are present at different tanks in the site.

Comment: Will the pending tank implosions impede completing the IR program cleanup?
Response: No.

Paul also expressed concern about the presence of free product. Free product is a mass of petroleum that floats on the groundwater, like salad oil. It is often difficult to capture it because it is so viscous.

Comment: How deep is the water table?
Response: It's about 15 to 25 feet below ground surface. It usually follows the slope of the land.

Comment: What is the depth to bedrock?
Response: The tanks were constructed in the bedrock. It's about 10 feet.

The tanks themselves are about 118 feet across the 35 feet deep. Brian described the tank cleaning process. In order to access them, holes were cut in the tank tops. Tank water was pumped to a temporary treatment plant and the sludge was removed. A water and caustic cleaning solution was used to clean the tanks, which were then filled with water and covered with steel plates.

The implosion will drop the tank tops into the tanks; the walls will remain intact. The chasm will be filled with clean fill.

As a final UST action, the Navy is considering using bioremediation or natural attenuation and monitoring. A corrective action plan will be sent to the state soon. Physical removal of the contamination would cost approximately $2 million per tank.

Paul noted that tank inspections and chip sampling results revealed that tank cleaning was successful in some areas but not others. Reballasting the tanks with water would allow oil to leach from the tanks so that it would be dealt with if necessary at a later date. The Navy was given the option to either reclean the tanks or acknowledge that contamination remained and commit to implementing an intensive monitoring program. The Navy chose the latter option.

Comment: Why can I still smell oil here?
Response: The cleaning process was not able to remove all the oil. We ballasted the tanks with water (instead of fill) because oil would be separable from the water if it leached from the tank walls. No. 6 oil flows like molasses so it is slow to attenuate and difficult to capture.

## OLD FIRE FIGHTING TRAINING AREA (OFFTA) - SITE 9

OFFTA is a 5-acre site. It was actively used from 1943 to 1972 to conduct ship compartment fire fighting training exercises. A ringed area was filled with oil and gasoline and ignited. This practice and leaks from the piping system that supported it resulted in soil

contamination. In 1975, these structures were demolished and were buried in the two mounds left on the site. Additional site investigations for the OFFTA were completed in 1997 and an offshore ecological risk assessment is underway (costing around $700,000 and due in 1999). The results of that ERA will be incorporated into the Phase I and II remedial investigations undertaken in the early 1990s. The project is fully funded.

Paul discussed the history of test pitting at the site. In 1994, that activity revealed that a significant amount of oil-contaminated soil was present but none at the ground surface. He passed out photographs of the site when it was active and discussed the operations conducted at the site. He also provided photographs depicting contaminated soil unearthed during test pitting activities.

Comment: Have borings been made in the mounds to determine what is in them?
Response: We can find no documentation about what happened to the structures when they were demolished in 1975; a boring we took in the center of the large mound was difficult. Test pits provided more information.

Comment: Do any human health risks remain?
Response: Studies indicate there is contamination in the subsurface soil, which will be addressed in the RI/FS, but there are no unacceptable risks in the surface soil.

Kymberlee Keckler indicated that there was some disagreement on the potential health risks. After Jim asked her to elaborate, Kymberlee indicated that EPA was concerned about metals, PCBs, and carcinogenic PAHs and did not believe that the area was an appropriate place for a playground. A discussion ensued about the correct input to EPA's biokinetic lead uptake model that both EPA and the Navy used to determine whether risk existed. Jim recommended that this issue be further discussed between the Navy and EPA. Captain Wyman, having just approved OFFTA to be opened as a military youth center, expressed concern and asked that he be given a full briefing as soon as possible.

Paul indicated that the concentrations of lead reported by the Navy would exceed state Department of Health Standards.

DERECKTOR SHIPYARD - SITE 19

The Navy leased this 41-acre site to the RI Port Authority, which sublet it to Robert E. Derecktor from 1979 to 1992. Operations generated large quantities of sand blast grit and paint wastes. The Navy conducted a preliminary assessment in 1993 and removal actions from 1994 through 1997 to dispose of drums and tanks filled with sand blast grit. (Fourteen thousand cubic yards of sandblast grit was disposed under the McAllister Point Landfill cap). Five buildings were demolished in 1997 (NUWC wants to use the property).

An onshore Study Area Screening Evaluation revealed that high levels of PCBs in soil around test pit 14, and that the Building 42 sumps needed to be cleaned and unused catch basins should be closed. After the removal action to deal with these areas began, PCBs were found

to be more extensive than anticipated; a more focused study is underway to delineate the PCBs removal area. The off-shore ecological risk assessment was completed, finding that several areas off the Shipyard pose a risk to bay biota. Based on these findings, a human health risk assessment showed that several areas off the Shipyard pose risk to people who consume the shellfish from the offshore risk areas. We are now in the process of developing cleanup goals for the offshore areas and expect a draft feasibility study to be submitted in September.

Comment: When the removals are completed, will that be the end to onshore activities?
Response: Yes, but we will do confirmatory sampling to be sure. Paul noted that the Screening Site Assessment Report did not investigate hazardous waste storage areas and other potentially contaminated areas that were identified in early studies. The Navy has agreed to investigate these areas as funding becomes available.

Paul handed out photographs depicting the site and hazardous waste storage areas.

Comment: What about Robert Derecktor?
Response: EPA and RIDEM have already brought him to court and had him fined. The Navy will attempt to recover cleanup costs at a later date.

MCALLISTER POINT LANDFILL - SITE 1

This 10.8-acre site was an active landfill from the 1950s through the mid-1970s, receiving domestic refuse, spent acids, paints, solvents, waste oils, and construction debris. A record of decision was signed in 1993 for a multi-layer cap and stone revetment, with long-term monitoring for groundwater and landfill gas. An offshore ecological risk assessment was completed in March 1997 that determined that sediment in nearshore and some offshore areas posed unacceptable risk. A final version of the feasibility study to present possibl cleanup alternatives is due in August, with a record of decision planned for 1999.

An incinerator was present on site during the first part of the landfill operation. Paul provided photographs of the site when it was operating, depicting the filling in of the bay. The pictures show that a beach developed at the base of the landfill in what was formerly open water; the depth of the water at the base of the landfill may have been as deep as ten feet. Paul shared other photographs showing contaminated soil and groundwater observed during cap construction.

White gas vents dot the landfill. They are monitored regularly; however, the state wants non-ambient samples collected and additional laboratory analysis, so the monitoring procedure is being modified with RIDEM. The Navy has also conducted four rounds of groundwater monitoring, which have shown very low contaminant levels. Although other landfills are usually just covered with grass and mowed, the Navy also planted native vegetation with shallow roots at McAllister.

Comment: How much will the offshore remediation cost?
Response: It will be relatively expensive. The active cleanup alternatives range from $13 to $24 million.

Comment: Where is the Newport POTW outfall located?
Response: It is near Bishop Point, off Coddington Point.

Comment: Was removing the material from Melville North Landfill to the McAllister Point Landfill cap included in $13 million it cost to build the McAllister cap?
Response: Disposing of Melville's waste under the McAllister cap would be a cost attributed to the Melville cleanup.

Although there was not enough time to visit the other IR sites, they were discussed briefly.

GOULD ISLAND - SITE 17

The IR site on Gould Island is the electroplating shop. The Navy is finalizing the work plan but no funds are available to conduct the field work. The Army Corps of Engineers, which the Navy had hoped would conduct the field work in conjunction with their own on the island, also does not have the funds this fiscal year. There is still a possibility that these activities will be completed by the Corps when additional money is available.

Comment: Is there any Navy activity on Gould Island?
Response: NUSC uses the southern end of the island to test torpedo motors.

There is no active work underway at Gould, Coddington Cover Rubble Landfill, and NUSC. The Navy has focused on activity at the worst sites. These sites are considered a lower priority than the sites the Navy is actively working on.

The tour finished in time to return the bus back to Building 1 by 8 pm. The Navy invited everyone back to the Officers' Club for pastry.

NEXT RAB MEETING

The next RAB meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, August 19, 1998.

The agenda includes a presentation by Paul Yaroschak and Franco LaGrega on the IR sites cleanup funding process.

Enclosures: NETC RAB Committee Member Roster (with draft)
NETC RAB Community Members (with draft)